BX
4705
.B17sa
v.2

The Second Part of Mr. Bower's Answer to a Scurrilous Pamphlet...

By

Archibald Bower

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
AT LOS ANGELES

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/mrbowersanswerto02boweiala

THE SECOND PART OF MR. *BOWER'S* ANSWER TO A SCURRILOUS PAMPHLET, &c. WITH REMARKS ON THE SIX LETTERS, Proving them to be FORGED.

LONDON:

Printed for W. SANDBY, at the *Ship*, opposite *St. Dunstan's* Church, *Fleet-Street*.

M.DCC.LVII.

THE

SECOND PART

OF

Dr. BOWER'S

ANSWER

TO A

PUBLICOS PAMPHLET, &c.

WITH

REMARKS

ON THE

SIX LETTERS;

Proving them to be Forgeries.

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA
AT LOS ANGELES LIBRARY

Printed for W. SANDBY, at the Ship, opposite
St. Dunstan's Church, Fleet-Street.

MDCCLVII.

BX
4705
B73D7
v. 2

LIBRARY SETS JBL 1-9-41

REMARKS

ON THE

SIX LETTERS.

Promiſed in the foregoing part of my Anſwer to demonſtrate the Six Letters, aſcribed to me by the Jeſuits, to be as *impudent*, as *abſurd*, as *barefaced* a forgery as *Rome* or the emiſſaries of *Rome* ever atttempted to impoſe on mankind, if *falſe facts*, *falſe dates*, and *improbabilities bordering on impoſſibilities* are marks of forgery; and I ſhall now ſhew that theſe marks all evidently concur in the Letters in queſtion.

APR 26 1938

And to begin with falſe facts: It muſt be taken for granted that if I wrote thoſe Letters to Father *Sheldon*, he, as well as the reſt of the Jeſuits, believed me at that time reconciled to the Church and returned to my duty in the Order: For no man can ſuppoſe that he would have correſponded with me as a penitent, if, unabſolved from the greater excommunication which I had incurred by joining in communion with a Proteſtant Church, I had ſtill profeſſed the Proteſtant religion, and

HARDING

30692

refuſed as a Jeſuit to return to my duty. But that I never was nor pretended to be reconciled either to the Church or the Order can be eaſily ſhown. For had I been reconciled to the Church, I muſt have been preſent at maſs on Sundays and holy-days, in compliance with one of her chief precepts; had I been reconciled to the Order, I muſt, as a Prieſt and a Jeſuit, have ſaid maſs not only on Sundays and holy-days but every day, agreeably to the laws of the ſociety. But I challenge the whole body of Papiſts, Prieſts, and Jeſuits to ſay they ever ſaw me any where at maſs, or were preſent when I ſaid it, during the time Father *Sheldon* is ſuppoſed to have believed me reconciled to the Church and the Order, and to have thereupon correſponded with me as a penitent.

The Papiſts fix the æra of my reconciliation to the latter end of the year 1744 or the beginning of 1745, and pretend that I continued a Papiſt, or at leaſt outwardly to profeſs the Popiſh religion from that time to the publication of my preface, that is to the 25th of *March* 1747. But inſtead of complying, during that time, with any of the precepts of the *Romiſh* Church, or laws of the Order, I continued to join in communion with the Church of *England*, and to expreſs as great an abhorrence, as I had ever done before, of the idolatry and the other errors of the Church of *Rome*, as the perſons, with whom I lived and converſed at that time well know and are ready to atteſt. My reconciliation therefore muſt have been only pretended. But on the other hand how could I pretend to be reconciled to the Church and the Order, how could Father *Sheldon* and the reſt of the Jeſuits believe me for two or three years together reconciled to the Church and returned to my obedience in the Order, when I obeyed, during that time, none of the precepts or laws of the one or the other, nay when I acted

in

in direct oppoſition to them all? In ſhort, I am made to ſpeak in thoſe Letters as a ſincere penitent returned to the boſom of the Church and my duty in the Order; but how could I have aſſumed that character in writing to the Provincial, when every Jeſuit in town could have informed him that they had never ſeen me aſſiſt at any function of the Popiſh religion as a Papiſt, nor perform any as a Prieſt and a Jeſuit; nay when they could not but know that I lived in the ſame manner as I had done before, kept the ſame company, ſpoke with the ſame abhorrence ridicule and contempt of the Popiſh doctrines, and ſtill continued to communicate with the Church of *England?* If the Letters therefore be genuine I really was, or pretended to be reconciled to the Church of *Rome* and the Order of the Jeſuits for the ſpace of two or three years, and Father *Sheldon* believed me ſincere, though during that time I never complied with any of the duties of the one or the other, but acted openly in a manner to have drawn on myſelf the cenſures of *Rome* though I had never incurred them before. It does not appear from any one of the Letters that Father *Sheldon* and the reſt of the Jeſuits entertained the leaſt doubt of my being ſincere. There is no notice taken of any ſuſpicions expreſſed by them, no attempt on my ſide to excuſe or to palliate the irregularity of my conduct, all the difficulty ſuppoſed is with regard to their willingneſs and ability to pay back the money to me ſo ſoon as my preſſing occaſions required. And yet what proofs had I given them of the ſincerity of my return to the Church and the Order? Or rather what proofs had they not of my not acting agreeably to ſuch a return? Would they not have allotted me a place to ſay maſs in, at leaſt on Sundays and holy-days, as every Jeſuit is bound to do, indiſpenſibly bound? Would they have allowed me to talk the ſame lan-

guage in every company as muſt have given ſuch offence and ſcandal before? Could men, whoſe intelligence is ſo good in all places and in all points that concern them, be ſo ignorant of my doings, ſo groſsly deceived as to correſpond with me as a penitent Jeſuit when I led the life of a Proteſtant and of a layman? Theſe abſurdities are too groſs to be ſwallowed by any body, who will once reflect on them: They have only paſſed upon ſome for want of reflection.

But further what could induce me to return or pretend to return to the Church of *Rome* and my Order in 1744 or 1745? I was at that time in better circumſtances than I had ever yet been, had an annuity of 94 *l.* punctually paid me half-yearly, acquired every day more by my writings, and was honoured with the particular protection and friendſhip of ſeveral Proteſtants of rank and diſtinction. What could I then expect from the Papiſts? What advantage could I reap from my return to their Church? I ſay advantage, for as they will not allow me to have been actuated by motives of conſcience and conviction either in quitting their Church and the Order, or in returning to them again, but repreſent me by their tool the Libeller as one, *who invariable in the proſecution of what he looks upon as his immediate intereſt becomes all things to all men that he may gain ſomething*; *a Papiſt to day, a Proteſtant tomorrow, again a Papiſt if it can ſerve a turn, and even a champion for Proteſtants without being a Chriſtian* (Firſt Libel, *p.* 35.), they muſt point out ſome great object, ſome conſiderable gain that I had in my view in becoming or pretending to become once more a Papiſt and a Jeſuit, and not make a man actuated by motives of intereſt alone take ſuch an extraordinary and hazardous ſtep without any proſpect of gain or advantage

vantage accruing to him from it, or any neceſſity impelling him to it.

This taſk the Libeller undertakes in page 33 of his Firſt Libel and his words are, *whether* conſcience *had any ſhare in influencing his endeavours to regain the confidence of his* Order, *is known only to himſelf: but, certainly, his* intereſt *viſibly prompted him to take ſuch a ſtep. He was now declining in life, and, after being in* England *a great many years, he had, as yet, gained no connexions that had procured him any* ſettlement, *and his ſubſiſtence depended upon the ſlaviſh employment of writing for bookſellers, and his uncertain gains as a language-maſter to ladies. What object, therefore, could be ſo deſirable to a perſon in his circumſtances, and happily diſengaged from religious prejudices, as to regain the protection and confidence of a body of men who had it in their power to make him* eaſy *and* happy, *the reſt of his days? Upon being reconciled to his* Order, *he had reaſon to hope that the public purſe of the ſociety might be open to him, as well as to other members of it, and that his income might be augmented by the addition of a ſalary as a miſſionary in this country, where it was his inclination to dwell. Mr.* B's *money tranſaction with Father* Shirburn, *when viewed in this light, ſeems perfectly conſiſtent with that prudent foreſight ſo remarkable in his character.*

Theſe were the motives, according to the Libeller, all motives of intereſt, that tempted me to return to the Order, and I was accordingly *re-admitted*, ſays he, *into the Order of* Jeſus *about the end of the year* 1744 *or the beginning of the year* 1745. *But Mr.* Bower, he adds in the following page 34, *having at length had the good fortune to inſinuate himſelf into the good graces of a powerful friend, he began to have a proſpect of advancing his intereſt more by declaring himſelf a Proteſtant than by being a Popiſh emiſſary.* In the next page he tells his readers, that *my new connexions with Proteſtants both able and willing*

willing to ſerve me, and other prudential motives obliged me to break off my renewed connexion with the Order.

Would any man but ſuch a ſcribbler as the author of this Libel have offered thus to account for my returning to the Order and leaving it again without firſt informing himſelf when my connexions with Proteſtants commenced, eſpecially *with a powerful friend both able and willing to ſerve me?* If he had had that attention he would have found that in 1744 and 1745 I had the ſame connexions, the ſame friends as in 1746 and 1747, and conſequently that it was not becauſe I had gained no connexions that I was reconciled to the Order in 1745, nor becauſe I had gained them that I reſolved to leave it anew in 1746, or, as the Libeller expreſſes it, that *I came to a final reſolution of making a ſecond breach of my vows*, an expreſſion he has borrowed of his fellow labourer the Popiſh prieſt *Butler*.

As for the other motive to which the Libeller aſcribes my reconciliation to the Order, *viz.* the hope I entertained of having my income augmented by the addition of a ſalary as a miſſionary, he might and ſhould have enquired before he imputed it to that motive, what ſalary is allowed by the Order of the Jeſuits to their miſſionaries in this kingdom, and whether it was an object capable of tempting a man *invariable in the proſecution of his immediate intereſt* to bid adieu to all his Proteſtant friends *both able and willing to ſerve him*, eſpecially to his *powerful friend*, and turn miſſionary. In that enquiry he would have found that the ſum of 30 *l.* a year, and no more, is allowed by the ſociety to a Jeſuit miſſionary here in town for lodging, raiment, and food; and that thoſe in the country receive nothing from the Order, but are maintained by the families they live with, and allowed 10 *l.* a

year

year for their raiment. I have obſerved in my *Anſwer* p. 110 that all private property being baniſhed from religious communities by the vow of poverty, whatever I poſſeſſed would upon my return to the Order be no longer mine but the Order's; ſo that to ſay *my intereſt viſibly prompted me to be reconciled to the Order* is as good ſenſe as to ſay, my intereſt viſibly prompted me to quit my Proteſtant friends *both willing and able to ſerve me*, to give up all I might expect from them and turn miſſionary in order to receive 30 *l.* a year or 10 *l.* in lieu of 94 *l.* and all the reſt of the money I had at that time. I will add, that had I been quite deſtitute of Proteſtant friends, had I had no proſpect of improving my fortune any otherwiſe than by my induſtry, nay had the Jeſuits left me in poſſeſſion of what I had, and even added to it the ſalary of a miſſionary, it would not have been my intereſt to return to them for ſuch an addition, as I acquired yearly twice that ſum *by writing for the bookſellers*, an employment not near ſo *ſlaviſh* as that of a miſſionary.

The Libeller therefore muſt point out ſome other object capable of tempting me to forſake all my Proteſtant friends, to give up the advantages I might promiſe myſelf from their friendſhip as they were *both willing and able to ſerve me*, and become anew a Papiſt and Jeſuit. Till he aſſigns ſome ſuch object, ſome ſuch motive of intereſt, every unprejudiced man muſt conclude, that I either never was reconciled to the Church and the Order, or, if I was, that I acted like a fool and a madman, and not like one, who *invariable in the proſecution of what he looks upon as his immediate intereſt, becomes all things to all men that he may gain ſomething*.

If the Libeller had a deſire to account for this unaccountable conduct in me, he had much better

ſaid, that being privately informed in the year 1744 of the deſign of my brother Jeſuit to make himſelf maſter of *Paraguay*, the motive of my returning at that time to the Order was to go over to him, and ſhare with him in the benefits of his Royalty there. This to a man of an adventurous ſpirit might be a temptation; and I hope that the next Letter my ingenious friend deſigns to bring forth will be from *Nicholas the Firſt of Paraguay* to me, inviting me to come over, and offering to make me his Viceroy or Prime Miniſter. But till *that* ſhall appear with ſufficient atteſtations that it was really writ by his *Paraguayan* Majeſty, he muſt excuſe all my friends if they are ſo obdurate as not to believe that I would renounce *out of intereſt* all the advantages I had in this country, and all I might hope for, and put myſelf in the power of my enemies in hopes of getting a ſalary of ten, or at moſt of 30 *l.* a year.

Were the Libeller accuſed, as I am by the Papiſts of being a ſecret Papiſt himſelf, I ſhould be glad to know in what other manner he could poſſibly clear himſelf from that imputation but by challenging them, as I have done, to ſay they ever ſaw him preſent at maſs or at any other function of the Popiſh religion, by proving that he not only had conſtantly joined in communion with Proteſtants, but expreſſed an utter averſion to Popery, and by ſhewing, if he were ſaid in his heart to be one of thoſe, who have no other God nor religion but *mammon*, that it was inconſiſtent with his intereſt to be a Papiſt.

In one of thoſe Letters (*Anſwer* p. 82.) I offer myſelf as ready to go to whatſoever part of the world the Provincial or the General of the Jeſuits ſhould think fit to ſend me. *As for myſelf*, they make me ſay in that Letter, *I ſhall name no place* to him, *viz.* the General, *but ſubmit myſelf entirely*

to

to his will; for I am now, thank God, quite indifferent as to places, and am well perſuaded that what place ſhall be thought by you or by him the moſt proper, will be the moſt proper. But at the very time I am ſuppoſed to have writ thus I was engaged in a treaty of marriage, as many perſons of unexceptionable veracity, who were then privy to it, are ready to atteſt. If the Letters in queſtion therefore are genuine, I was determined to ſettle here for life, as I have done ſince, and at the ſame time ready to break off all engagements, to bid farewell for ever to my friends and my country, and repair, at a minute's warning, to what part ſoever of the known world it ſhould pleaſe the General to ſend me, *Rome* itſelf not excepted, nor even *Macerata.*

In the ſame Letter I am made to write thus to the Provincial, *in my retreat I have endeavoured to confirm myſelf ſtill more in my former unalterable reſolution*; and in Letter 4th, p. 86, *I am determined, I hope, unalterably to keep my former reſolution.* And how will the Libeller reconcile *this unalterable reſolution* of living and dying in the Church of *Rome*, and the Order of the Jeſuits, *in ſpite of any thing that can happen*, with an engagement that ſubſiſted at that very time, and abſolutely excluded me from that Church and the Order?

As to the woman and the child ſo often mentioned in thoſe Letters, to whom the money, 1350*l.* is ſuppoſed to have belonged, I challenge the Libeller and with him all his Popiſh friends and allies to produce the one or the other, or any body that ever knew the one or the other. They have been everywhere ſought for and have been no-where found but in the Letters in queſtion, and the wicked hearts of their authors. And ſurely a woman of fortune, of family, injured in her fortune, unjuſtly turned off with her innocent child, and taken again, muſt

have ſome name, ſome friends, ſome relations, ſome acquaintance, ſome reſidence. And it is to be obſerved that this woman is ſuppoſed in the Letters to be my lawful wife; for nothing but marriage could entitle me to her fortune or impower me to diſpoſe of it; and in Letter 3d, p. 84, it is ſaid that *ſome ſecurity would have quieted both her and her relations*; ſo that her relations inſiſted, as well as ſhe, on my giving her ſome ſecurity for her fortune, or *continuing to live with her*, which it cannot be ſuppoſed they would have done if I had lived with her only as a concubine, or (to uſe the Libeller's phraſe) as my whore. Few women of that character are poſſeſſed of ſuch fortunes; and ſuch an alternative would never have been propoſed by any relations, no not the moſt infamous. My *continuing to live with her* inſtead of ſatisfying them, would have offended them more, unleſs ſhe had been my lawful wife; and if ſhe was ſuch, let this ſagacious enquirer find out when, in what church, by what clergyman we were married, what is become of her or the child, who are her relations, why they have left me poſſeſſed of her fortune even ſince I have married another woman, where it was I cohabited with her and when, how it could be concealed from all my friends, and how ſuch an engagement was conſiſtent with the other which I am able to prove?

When leading facts, facts that are the foundation, upon which a whole correſpondence is ſuppoſed to be grounded, are apparently falſe, it is the ſtrongeſt mark of forgery that can be brought to diſprove any ſuch correſpondence. Now that I ever was or pretended to be reconciled to the Church of *Rome* or the Order of the Jeſuits, that I ever offered myſelf as ready to go to whatever part of the world the Provincial or the General ſhould be pleaſed to command me, that I ever cohabited with a wo-

a woman, who brought me 1350*l.* either as a wife or a concubine, are evidently falſe facts, as I have here ſhown, and yet aſſerted or ſuppoſed in the Letters in queſtion; therefore the Letters in queſtion are evidently an *impudent and barefaced forgery.*

As to falſe dates, in Letter 3d the farewell Letter (p. 84, 85.) I am ſuppoſed to write thus; *I muſt repair the crying injuſtice I have done to an innocent child, and to a woman that has ſhown the greateſt regard for me even in my diſtreſs* (by the way I never have been in the leaſt diſtreſs theſe twenty years) *and in order to that accept the advantagious offer now made me by my friends*; and in the poſtſcript, *as for the place, it will be a fortnight before the patent is made out.* Now if this Letter be genuine, a place was offered me before the 25th of *March* 1747, the day on which I publiſhed my propoſals with the firſt page of the preface; for it is allowed that the farewell Letter was written before that time. But nothing is more certain than that no place was aſked or thought of for me by any of my friends till after I had the honour of preſenting to his Majeſty the firſt volume of my Hiſtory, which was on the 13th of *May* 1748. On the 10th of *September* 1748 Mr. *Say* keeper to the late Queen's library died, and about the 20th of the ſame month one of my friends, who lived in great intimacy with the late Mr. *Pelham*, applied for that place in my behalf. And this was the only place that was ever promiſed me, or that my friends ever aſked for me. This Letter muſt therefore be allowed to be a forgery, if falſe dates are marks of forgery, and they are among the ſtrongeſt marks. In truth this falſe date aroſe from a falſe report, which prevailed in the world when firſt it was known that I intended to write the Hiſtory of the Popes, *viz.* that I was encouraged to undertake it by the promiſe of a

place; whereas no such promise was really made, or any expectation of it conceived by me till my first volume was published.

It was positively asserted upon the authority of those Letters when they were first publicly shown, that I was relapsed into Popery, that I was reconciled to the Order, and that to enrich the Jesuits I had robbed a woman and her innocent child of their fortune. This was at first positively asserted, and without further enquiry trumpeted about by the lovers of scandal from one end of the town to the other. But the *injured woman* and the *injured child* could be no-where found, though everywhere sought for, nor did it appear that any place had been offered me at the time the Letter mentioning such a Place is supposed to have been writ. Hereupon they shifted their Ground, and instead of concluding Letters to be forged, in which they discovered such visible marks of forgery, they pretended the woman and the child and the place to be mere inventions and fictions not of the Jesuits but mine to impose on the innocent Fathers. For apprehending, said they, and so they say still, that upon the publication of my Preface the Jesuits would no longer pay me the interest of my money, and therefore wanting to recover it before I published my Preface, *I brought a woman and a child upon the stage*, pretending that the money did not belong to me but to them.

But if I had pretended that the money was the woman's and not mine, would not the Jesuits have enquired very strictly whether there really was a woman, and whether the money belonged to her, since by my returning to them it became theirs if there was no such woman, or if the money did not belong to her? No man can think that they would not have made such an enquiry in order to satisfy her and her relations if the money was hers, or to

detect

detect the impoſture I was putting upon them in ſuch an impudent manner, if it was not: and thus would the impoſture have at once been diſcovered. Surely no one ſo intimately acquainted with the Jeſuits as I, can be ſuppoſed to have tried to deceive them by a fraud ſo very open to detection as this, and to ſuppoſe their ſagacity would not have detected it, had I ſo done, is ſuppoſing the moſt crafty ſet of men upon earth the moſt eaſily overreached.

The whole drift of thoſe Letters is to prevail on Father *Sheldon* to repay me my money, and I am made to expreſs as violent a deſiré to get it from him *then* as if I were on the point of being carried to jail, or ready to ſtarve for want of it.

Now I can prove that even ſuppoſing I loſt all this money, which yet I was in no danger of loſing, I had ſtill ſo much left, and ſuch means in my power of acquiring more, as to have been under no neceſſity of taking any improper or dangerous methods of relieving my wants. But my annuity was ſecured by my bond, and Mr. *Hill* made no difficulty of repaying the principal when I deſired it, deducting what I had received over and above the common intereſt of 4 *l. per Cent.* And ſo far was I from being obliged to pay it away as ſoon as received (which I muſt have certainly done had my occaſions for it been urgent) that two months after I placed it in the New *South Sea* Annuities with 348 *l.* more, as appears by the books; where then was the immediate and preſſing neceſſity, which can be aſſigned as a cauſe in any manner adequate to ſuch an effect? There does not appear even the leaſt degree of temptation to induce me to write ſuch Letters as theſe, and profeſs myſelf a Papiſt in order to get this money repaid.

Of this difficulty the Libeller himſelf was aware, and let us ſee how he ſolves it. In his firſt Libel,

P. 35,

p. 35, he aſcribes the vaſt ſolicitude I expreſs to get my money back, and the various inventions I employ for that purpoſe, to *my being afraid leſt upon my ceaſing to profeſs myſelf a Jeſuit my annuity from the Jeſuits ſhould ceaſe.* But I had publiſhed my Preface to the Hiſtory of the Popes, which was *ceaſing to profeſs myſelf a Jeſuit,* near three months before the money was repaid me; and the Libeller tells us himſelf, that upon that publication Father *Sheldon* was in ſuch a hurry to pay me the money that he borrowed it, a plain proof that the worſt way I could take to get my money back was to feign myſelf a Papiſt. By their own account I was a Proteſtant when I lent them my money, and when they repaid it. But yet my ſolicitude to recover the money is the ſuppoſed cauſe of my turning Papiſt. To have turned *Jew* or *Mahometan* would have been of as much ſervice to me in that reſpect, and to affirm that I did ſo would have been the more probable tale of the two.

But the circumſtance of the time, when the Letters in queſtion are ſuppoſed to have been writ, is, perhaps, as ſtrong a proof of their not being authentic as any thing I have yet alledged againſt their authenticity. For they are ſuppoſed to have been writ in the years 1746 and 1747, that is, at the very time I was writing the Hiſtory of the Popes and of Popery, nay and one of them but a day or two before the publication of my Propoſals with the firſt page of the Preface, long before which my deſign of writing that Hiſtory was publicly known. And can any man think me capable of writing ſuch Letters to the Superior of the Jeſuits, and putting it thus in his power, and the power of every Jeſuit, to ruin my character with my Proteſtant friends at the very time I was upon the point of provoking them in that manner, can any man, I ſay, think me capable of having acted

ſo

ſo ſenſeleſs a part merely to get back from the Jeſuits a ſum of money I did not want, which I knew they would return to me, and for which in the mean time they paid me an intereſt of 7 *l. per Cent.* Are they, who do not believe me to have acted thus madly againſt all my intereſts, againſt all reaſon, and common ſenſe, fools or knaves? and may it not be ſuppoſed that he, who ſcurrilouſly aſſerts that they are, is a mixture of both?

If the Libeller were charged with a robbery on the highway (and it is no leſs improbable that he ſhould have committed ſuch a robbery than that I ſhould have turned Papiſt and Jeſuit in 1744) and a Letter produced wherein he owned it, as like his writing as if he had writ it himſelf, I ſhould be glad to know by what other means he could prove the Letter to be forged, and make his innocence appear, but by ſhowing that he was in no want of money at the time the robbery is ſuppoſed to have been committed; that if he had been in want he could have ſupplied it by other means without expoſing himſelf to any riſque; that a cauſe aſſigned in the Letter to prove that he had then an immediate and preſſing occaſion for the money was abſolutely falſe, and that he had conſtantly behaved ſo as to leave no room for any man who knew him to entertain the leaſt ſuſpicion of his committing ſuch a crime. If he could beſides point out falſe dates, and falſe facts aſſerted or ſuppoſed in that Letter, there is no Jury that would not, in ſpite of the *external evidence* of the hand-writing acquit him upon ſuch *internal proofs of its falſhood*, and pronounce, without heſitating a ſingle moment, the Letter a moſt impudent and barefaced forgery. That this is my caſe, with reſpect to the Letters in queſtion, I have irrefragably proved, and therefore do not at all doubt that every candid and unprejudiced reader will acquit me of the charge of

having turned Papiſt and Jeſuit in 1744, and pronounce the Letters ſuppoſing me to have taken ſuch an extraordinary ſtep, *an evident and palpable forgery*, notwithſtanding the external evidence of the hand-writing, the only evidence the Libeller has produced to authenticate thoſe Letters. As for the money tranſaction, far from proving me to have been reconciled to the Church of *Rome* or the Order of the Jeſuits, it proves quite the contrary, as I have ſhown, I can ſay, to the entire ſatisfaction of every unprejudiced reader (my Anſwer, p. 101, *et ſeq.*). It is therefore no proof of the genuineneſs of the Letters, though it has given occaſion to the forging of them, and has been made the ground-work of all that is ſaid in them.

As for the ſimilitude of the hand-writing, I will allow the Six Letters to be as like my hand-writing as the Libeller pleaſes, ſince I have not yet been ſuffered to inſpect them. But every lawyer will tell him, that inſtances are not wanting not only of a promiſſory note or a ſubſcription, but of wills and deeds much longer than theſe *Six long Letters* together, forged with ſuch art that no man could diſtinguiſh the copy from the original. And truly why may not an artiſt, capable of thus forging a promiſſory note conſiſting of two or three lines, forge a Lettter conſiſting of ten or twenty, and with time and by practice forge many more Letters and longer? Or to what number of lines will the Libeller confine that miſchievous art?

But *Mr.* B.'s *hand-writing is extremely remarkable*, ſays the Libeller, *and hath more particularities than are uſually met with. This circumſtance ſhews how difficult it muſt be to forge Letters bearing ſo ſtriking a reſemblance*, &c. But it happens that *this circumſtance* ſhows quite the contrary, it being far more eaſy, as they ſay who are ſkilled in detecting ſuch forgeries, to imitate a bad hand than a good one,

one, a hand that has many particularities than one that has none: and what they ſay is undoubtedly agreeable to reaſon.

I have never been allowed, as I have obſerved above, to inſpect thoſe Letters myſelf, and many low ſubterfuges and pitiful ſhifts have been uſed to prevent me from having a ſight of them. But one of my friends, who compared them with ſome manuſcript ſheets of my Hiſtory, printed long before thoſe Letters were ſhewn, obſerved that tho' I form the letter *d ſometimes with a long open ſweep, and ſometimes ſhort and with a curled top*, yet the one was in far greater proportion in the one manuſcript than it was in the other; a nicety that ſeems to have eſcaped the attention of the ſkilful operator. This is what my friend obſerved, and a very juſt obſervation it is, and not what the Libeller makes him obſerve in page 43 of his firſt Libel.

The farewell Letter, p. 84, muſt have been writ but a day or two before the publication of the Propoſals and the firſt page of the Preface to the *Hiſtory of the Popes*, as I have proved in my Anſwer, p. 90. And yet in that Letter I am made *heartily to wiſh that it were in the power of the Provincial to make me eaſy in a* FORTNIGHT, *and prevent the impending ruin.* And can any man really believe that I wrote thus to the Provincial, and took a ſtep the very next or the following day that put an end to my correſpondence with him and the Jeſuits in general? That I allowed him a fortnight to *prevent the impending ruin*, and the very next day, or the day after, put it out of his power to prevent it? They, who believe it, muſt either be themſelves, or ſuppoſe me to have been at that time, wholly deſtitute of all common ſenſe.

At the very time when thoſe Letters are ſuppoſed to have been written, Mr. *Millar*, Bookſeller, manager of the *Modern Univerſal Hiſtory*, would

willingly have engaged me for the whole of that work. Had I accepted this offer thoſe Letters would never have been heard of: But though the ſhare I had in writing the *Antient Univerſal Hiſtory* had proved ſo very advantageous to me, I declined being anywiſe concerned in the *Modern* in order to write the Hiſtory of the Popes, and publiſh it at my own expence, without promiſe of place, penſion, or any other reward whatſoever. And can any man poſſibly think that, if I had writ thoſe Letters, I would have refuſed ſo advantageous an offer to undertake, at my own charge, ſo expenſive a work, when I could not but know that every Jeſuit had it in his power to diſcredit both me and my work? A ſenſible man may be a rogue, as the Libeller obſerves in p. 55 of his firſt Libel. But a ſenſible man cannot well be ſuppoſed to act like a natural fool or a madman, when his credit, his intereſt, his all is at ſtake.

I ſhall add, that had I writ thoſe Letters, I ſhould have taken care to prevent their having ever been ſhown to any living ſoul. I needed only to have prefixed to each Letter the word *ſoli*, *to you alone*, which is the ſame thing with the Jeſuits as *ſub ſigillo confeſſionis*, under the ſeal of confeſſion, an inviolable ſeal. Thus the Jeſuits write to their Superiors, the General, or the Provincials, when they want the contents of their letters to be kept ſecret: and the Superior is bound to deſtroy the letter as ſoon as he has anſwered it, in the ſame manner as a Confeſſor is bound to deſtroy or return to the penitent a written confeſſion of his ſins. No Secretary, except the General's private Secretary, dares read a letter to which the word *ſoli* is prefixed, no more than the perſon, to whom it was written, dares ſhow it. I ſaid, *except the General's private Secretary*; for the General, to whom many ſuch letters may come, as the Jeſuits from all parts of the world

apply to him, is allowed a private Secretary, who may read thoſe letters, and anſwer them as directed by him, but muſt keep the contents ſecret and deſtroy the letters when anſwered. Of this I could not be ignorant; and can any man think that I would not have taken ſo eaſy a method of ſecuring myſelf from any publication of this correſpondence, had I been ſo abſurd as to have entered into it without any one rational motive? But I repeat it again, *ſome exceeding ſtrong motive, ſome cogent neceſſity* muſt be alledged to make it credible, that a man in his ſenſes ſhould act in the manner I am ſaid to have acted.

The authors of the *Critical Review*, whom I find in the number of my enemies, and am ſorry to find it, becauſe ſome amongſt them are men of good parts, in order, as they ſay, to ſhow the abſurdity of my defence, make uſe of this ſimile. Let us imagine a highwayman thus addreſſing a judge upon the bench: "My Lord, I am amazed "your Lordſhip ſhould give any credit to what "this evidence has ſo poſitively ſworn againſt me. "Is it poſſible, my Lord, that I ſhould be ſo very "ſilly a fellow as to rob on the highway, when "your Lordſhip knows I could not do it without "running the riſque of being hanged?" *Critic. Review, vol. i. p. 563.*

This would be indeed a moſt abſurd plea: but is this a fair ſtating of my defence? No, my defence is, that I was not ſo very ſilly a fellow as to riſque being undone *without having the leaſt temptation to do ſo*; that I was in no want of money; that I was not incited by any diſtreſs to endeavour to get the money in queſtion by dangerous methods; that the evidence brought againſt me to prove that I was is apparently falſe in that and other particulars, and upon the whole moſt incredible. This, I apprehend, would be a good plea at any bar but

that of thoſe writers, who by their whole manner of ſtating the argument on one ſide or the other, have ſhown themſelves very partial and violent againſt me, as any man of good ſenſe will allow who reads their performance.

I ſhall add here the *New Popiſh Creed*, that the Libeller impoſes on his readers, and would have them all implicitly to conſent and aſſent to:

We believe that Mr. *Bower*, to get back a ſum of money he was in no want of, and for which he received an annuity of no leſs than 7 *l. per Cent.* pretended to turn Papiſt in the year 1745, and in the year 1746 began a correſpondence with the Jeſuits as a penitent returned to their Church, which he continued till the 25th of *March* in the year 1747, two days before he publiſhed his Propoſals for the Hiſtory of the Popes, and a year after he had declared his having reſolved to engage in that work.

We alſo believe, that when he carried on the aforeſaid correſpondence he was married to a woman, who had a child, and whoſe relations were acquainted with her being his wife; and yet that wife, that child, thoſe relations can no-where be found.

We believe too, that the money he had lent to Father *Hill* belonged to that woman, though he can prove it was all his own, and that he diſpoſed of it as ſuch after it had been returned to him by Father *Hill*.

But in caſe any ſhall think theſe two laſt propoſitions abſurd and incredible, we permit them to believe that they were a wicked invention of *Bower* to impoſe on the Jeſuits, and that the good fathers believed it without any enquiry; though if the money he had lent them did not belong to that woman, it muſt have been theirs, and not his, as ſoon as he returned to the Order again; and though nothing

nothing could be more eaſy than to make that enquiry.

And to ſhow our further regard and indulgence to ſcrupulous conſciences, we permit any, who chuſe it, to believe that this fiction was not quite a fiction, but that the woman mentioned in the Letters as married to *Bower* and having a child, was a woman to whom he never was married, and who had no child; and that the cauſe of his being in ſuch a terrible hurry to get his money back was a demand, which this woman can be proved to have made upon him three years after that money was paid (*See Mr.* Bower's *Anſwer to a New Charge*).

And we believe, that having put it in the power of the Jeſuits to ruin his credit and fortune in *England*, he proceeded to irritate them as much as he could by a public attack on the whole ſyſtem of the Popiſh religion.

We further believe, that from the year 1744 or 1745 he was a Papiſt and a Jeſuit, without having in all that time performed any of the duties, which as ſuch he was indiſpenſably obliged to perform; and that the Jeſuits knew this, and yet correſponded with him as one returned to their Church and their Order.

And we believe and declare, that whoever does not believe the ſaid Propoſitions is a wicked accomplice of the ſaid *Bower* or a natural fool.

Having now ſhewn what my enemies, and particularly the Libeller, require all thoſe of their faith to believe, I ſhall give a ſincere account to the reader what I myſelf believe concerning thoſe Letters.

I believe that ninety-nine in a hundred of the Roman Catholics in this kingdom, and particularly the Gentleman, in whoſe poſſeſſion they are and have been for ſome time, are as incapable of having forged them, or of countenancing ſuch a forgery,

if

if they knew it to be ſo, as any of my friends would be to forge Letters againſt them: but I believe there are Jeſuits and other miſſionaries here very capable of employing thoſe, or ſtill blacker means of defaming any perſon, who has left them, and who they think may do hurt to the Popiſh religion.

I do not believe it was any apprehenſion of my parts or capacity, that made them think me a dangerous enemy, but the circumſtance of my having been a Jeſuit and a member of the Holy Inquiſition. As ſuch they feared I might attack them with more perfect knowlege and greater authority than moſt other men, and that my teſtimony againſt them would make more impreſſion than that of perſons bred up in the Reformed Religion, and whoſe prejudices had always been on that ſide. To prevent the effect this might have on the minds of the Catholics here, I believe that as ſoon as they knew I deſigned to write the Hiſtory of the Popes theſe Letters were forged. By what hand, or how conveyed from one to another, it is impoſſible for me to conjecture. I will not, without proof, charge any one man, much leſs any family with ſuch an impoſture: I will not even accuſe Father *Sheldon* of having been knowingly concerned in the fraud, how freely ſoever his name has been uſed in this ugly affair: Nor do I believe that at firſt, or for a long time, there was any intention that the Letters ſhould become the talk of the Public, or be ſeen by any Proteſtants, who might be willing or able to call the authenticity and credit of them in queſtion.

I believe that they were deſigned for the uſe of the Catholics to diſcredit with them the Hiſtory of the Popes, and hinder any converts from being made by it; or, at moſt, that by a dark whiſper of there being

being ſuch proofs of my inſincerity my character might be hurt among perſons to whom I was not well known. But upon the unexpected and aſtoniſhing countenance given to them laſt year by two or three Proteſtants, without any further enquiry or examination than whether the writing reſembled mine, the Papiſts were emboldened to go a great deal further than they had intended, and further than (if I am not miſinformed) ſome of the wiſeſt of them think they ought to have done. The Letters were publicly ſhown to many perſons of unqueſtionable zeal for the Proteſtant cauſe, and even to my moſt intimate friends, who, as ſoon as they got any poſitive information that they were to be ſeen, deſired to ſee them, and ſaw evident marks of forgery in them. But, though they were not convinced of my having writ them, the Libeller was, and undertook to convince the whole world, while the Papiſts ſtood by and rejoiced in the efforts of their Proteſtant champion.

How far he has ſucceeded the Public will judge when they have read my Defence as well as my Charge. If ſome have been ſtartled by the confidence of that Charge, and had not patience to wait till I made my Defence, I am not ſurprized. Mankind are too apt to be quick in deciding, and to yield a haſty aſſent to a peremptory, petulant, bold accuſation, eſpecially when the party accuſed is compelled to defer his Reply for ſome length of time, as I was by many circumſtances in the nature of the Charge, which the Libeller brought not againſt me alone, but other innocent perſons, whoſe reputation I thought myſelf bound to defend.

Far be it therefore from me to affirm that none can have entertained a prejudice againſt me in regard to thoſe Letters, without being *knaves* or *natural fools*. I will not even aſſert that the retaining that prejudice will prove them to be ſo; I am not ſuch

ſuch a coxcomb: but I hope and I truſt that the far greater part will be candid enough to re-conſider the cauſe before they paſs ſentence, and that the ſentence will be uninfluenced by party or paſſion.

It is not my intention to trouble the world any more on this ſubject. I am not important enough to deſerve that they ſhould give me any more of their time and attention. If the Letters to *Sheldon* are proved to be mine, I merit no credit as to any thing elſe I can ſay for myſelf: if they are forgeries, thoſe who forged them can, I think, merit none as to any thing elſe they bring to defame me. The Libeller may get money by ſpreading their calumnies in eighteen-penny pamphlets, and while he does ſo may find his account in a perpetual controverſy upon this ſubject, or other ſupplemental and new-invented lies; but I ſhall leave him to carry it on by himſelf and return to the Hiſtory of the Popes with all diligence, that I may endeavour to make the Public amends for the time I have ſpent in defending myſelf againſt the new Inquiſition ſet up in this kingdom. But if my diſpatch in purſuing that work ſhould not be ſo great as I deſire, I hope it will be conſidered that my health has been hurt by the anxiety and vexation, which I could not but feel from an attack of this nature. For notwithſtanding the ſupport that my innocence gives me, and the kindneſs of my friends, who have had too much virtue to give me up to the rage of unjuſt defamation, I know that to be called to a public defence of every article of my paſt life, to be obliged to anſwer every lie that private malice or enmity can produce to aſperſe either me or my friends, both living and dead; to be obliged to ſpeak to the Public on the moſt private domeſtic affairs, or to ſuffer by my ſilence; to have a powerful ſect, powerful even in this country, notwith-

withſtanding the jealouſy of the legiſlature and government, engaged to attack me, not with fair arguments as I attack them, but with the foul and envenomed weapons of ſlander; and to ſee them ſupported in ſuch an attack by a party of Proteſtants more furious and bitter againſt me than they; all this I know is a grievous misfortune, and enough to diſorder the beſt conſtitution of body or mind. I pray God that the miſchief may ſtop with me: but no innocent man, no innocent woman, no family can be ſafe if ſuch proceeding as this be encouraged. The Inquiſition ſet up againſt me will ſoon enlarge and extend its juriſdiction. Invitations will be ſent to the enemies of other perſons, as well as to mine, to tranſmit their intelligence of ſlander againſt them; and that intelligence will be publiſhed in papers and pamphlets by anonymous ſcribblers, to the great entertainment of the malicious, ill-natured, and envious part of mankind, but to the ruin of all ſociety and all private peace. This is an evil in which the Public is much more concerned than in my converſations with Mrs. *Hoyles* or Mrs. *Sutton*; and if the Libeller, who has begun it, receives their applauſe, they will have no right to complain that his example is followed by ſeveral others, and that their ſiſters, their daughters, their wives are defamed by hear-ſay reports of twenty years ſtanding; nay after they have been laid many years in their graves. For even the grave is not an aſylum againſt the fury of this Inquiſition. Like their Brothers in *Italy*, *Spain*, and other countries, where that moſt holy Tribunal prevails, they paſs ſentence on the dead as well as the living, and pronouce damnation againſt them; if they have ſhewn any friendſhip, or given any protection to one, whom their equitable court has condemned. Anſwers and confutations will ſignify nothing. As faſt as one lie is

deſtroyed another will be ſpawned, and the language will be; " 'Tis in vain to defend yourſelf " from this charge; we have others behind; you " don't know how far our intelligence reaches; " *we reſerve our fire* (Second Libel, p. 83.)."

But is this the language of a lover of truth, of one only concerned for juſtice and truth? It is the language of a highwayman endeavouring to intimidate the man he aſſaults, " Sir, don't defend " yourſelf, *I reſerve my fire*, I have more piſtols " than this in my hand; I have one in my pocket; " I have one in my boſom; I have other friends " on the road whom you don't ſee at preſent; we " are a ſtrong gang; it will be to no purpoſe for " you to reſiſt."

Upon my word I believe the man ſays very true: they are a ſtrong gang; but I flatter myſelf that juſtice and truth will be ſtronger than they. Yet if theſe methods of attacking the fame of innocent perſons ſhould meet with encouragement inſtead of deteſtation; if the ſpirit of party ſhould join to promote them; if it ſhould prove both a ſafe and a profitable trade; juſtice and truth will quickly be baniſhed out of this kingdom, and calumny will be advanced to reign in their ſtead.

As for me, the courſe of nature muſt ſoon put an end to all my vexations: but the youngeſt man now alive will not ſee an end of the miſchief that ſociety will ſuffer from the conſequences of this perſecution begun againſt me, if the manner of carrying it on be not branded with the infamy it deſerves.

I ſhall conclude with this wiſh; may there be found in all Proteſtants, eſpecially in all the Proteſtant clergy, as much zeal to defend the Proteſtant cauſe and to expoſe the whole ſyſtem of Popiſh ſuperſtition, injuſtice, and cruelty, as there has been in me, who am accuſed of being in ſecret a Papiſt and a Jeſuit.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

As my renders will expect that I ſhould clear myſelf from the charge of perverting Mrs. *Hoyles* to Popery before I take my leave of the Public, I ſhall here give an account of that affair, ſo far as I can remember it at the diſtance of twenty-nine or thirty years.

I had no kind of acquaintance with that ſilly woman till Mrs. *Sutton*, with whom I was well acquainted, told me that ſhe had a confidant in her neighbourhood, the wife of one Mr. *Hoyles*, a printer's journeyman, with whoſe room ſhe could make free, and deſired I would allow her to introduce me to her, as one in whom ſhe could entirely confide. To this I conſented: and thus did my acquaintance commence with Mrs. *Hoyles*. I thenceforth continued to meet Mrs. *Sutton* in her room, ſhe being ſometimes preſent, and taking ſometimes a pretence to go abroad and leave us alone, as it had been before-hand agreed between Mrs. *Sutton* and her ſhe ſhould do. Mrs. *Sutton* was afterwards married; and I defy Mrs. *Hoyles* to ſay that I ever met her, or deſired to meet her alone, either in her room or any-where elſe, after her marriage. From moral honeſty I am ſure I have never departed; and I would to God that throughout my whole life I had alſo lived according to the ſtrict purity and ſanctity enjoined by the Goſpel. But is every man's character who has not done this to be blaſted? What then will become of many of thoſe who are my accuſers? Indeed if a man ſets up for a *ſaint*, to prove that he was a *ſinner* while he wore the maſk of that ſanctity is ſufficient to prove that he was an impoſtor, and conſequently is enough to diſcredit his character. But when did I aſſume ſuch a maſk? I

appeal to all my acquaintance whether I ever pretended to any other praiſe than that of an honeſt man; and I defy all the malice of *Rome* and of Hell to ſhow that by any action of all my paſt life (whatever my follies and frailties have been) I ever deſerved to forfeit that praiſe. I had been certainly wiſer if I had taken more care to conceal all my frailties; but men of underſtanding will think that my having wanted that wiſdom is not a ſymptom of an hypocrite or an impoſtor.

As for the *converſion* of Mrs. *Hoyles*, about which ſuch a noiſe is now made, from what I have ſaid, and from her own account, it is manifeſt that my acquaintance with her was not owing to any deſign or deſire in me of making a proſelyte. But in ſome accidental diſcourſes in her company, I may have poſſibly ſpoke (as I ſtill think myſelf bound in candour to ſpeak) of the *ſpiritual exerciſes* uſed by the Jeſuits, and ſome other inſtitutions and practices of the Order, or of the Church of *Rome*, as pious in themſelves and conducive to holineſs, though by them miſapplied. I may have alſo defended that Church when unjuſtly accuſed of holding opinions ſhe does not hold, as ſhe frequently is from zeal without knowledge. And from hence Mrs. *Hoyles*, a very weak woman, may have conceived ſilly ſcruples, which ſcruples Mrs. *Sutton*, who was a zealous Papiſt, improved in my abſence (for I went ſoon after into the country), and brought a prieſt to her, by whom ſhe was gained over to the Popiſh religion, and received into that Church. She did not therefore owe her converſion to me, but to her friend Mrs. *Sutton*, and to the prieſt ſhe brought to her. Indeed herſelf only ſays, that *I gave her ſcruples*, and that *three years after* I had given her thoſe ſcruples ſhe *became a Catholic* (Firſt Libel, p. 75, 76.). A plain proof that it was not from the ſcruples I had given her, but

from

from the impreſſions made upon her by others, that ſhe was induced to change her religion.

As for her narrative, it contains as many falſehoods as lines, was evidently made for her by the authors of the Six Letters to confirm by her teſtimony all that is ſaid or ſuppoſed in them, and ſhe repeats it, as I have been informed by ſome, who have had the curioſity to hear it from her own mouth, as a ſchool-boy does his leſſon by heart, in juſt the ſame words as it ſtands in the narrative.

But *ſhe will*, ſays the Libeller in page 80, *at any time convert her narrative into an Affidavit.* And will ſhe make oath that I, who was a profeſſed Jeſuit and lived twenty years in the Order, did not know, but applied to her to know, whether I *might truſt my money in the hands of the Jeſuits for an annuity*; that I employed her to *ſpeak to the Gentlemen of the Order*, as if I could not ſpeak to them myſelf, or my ſpeaking would not be of as much weight with them as hers; that I paſſed by Mrs. *Sutton*'s account for a merchant and a knight of *Malta*, two very different profeſſions and characters; that ſhe declared if *Mrs.* Sutton *and I could not marry, we ſhould not meet any more at her apartment*, though we continued to meet there with her full and free leave till Mrs. *Sutton* was married, and though, whenever ſhe was obliged to go out on the days of our meeting, ſhe uſed to ſend the key of her room to Mrs. *Sutton* leſt we ſhould be diſappointed? If Mrs. *Hoyles* ſhould confirm all theſe things upon oath, her oath would be of no weight with unprejudiced perſons, no more than her word, that is of no weight at all.

It is true that I deſired her huſband to print a thouſand Receipts for me; and it was in order to have an opportunity of paying him for ſome prints he had given me. I paid him accordingly for thoſe

thoſe Receipts double their value; but I never uſed one of them, and I have them ſtill by me.

As for Mr. *Faden*'s evidence (p. 82.) which the Libeller boaſts of as a Proteſtant evidence, it is a hearſay evidence, and that of Mrs. *Hoyles* over again.

I knew nothing of the change Mr. *Hoyles* had made of his religion till long after it happened; and, if I was not miſinformed at the time, it was owing to the importunity of his wife and motives of intereſt more than to conviction and conſcience. For the Jeſuits, it ſeems, had given him ſome hopes of their employing him as their Printer; and as ſuch they employed him accordingly after his converſion. A ſilly woman having therefore conceived ſcruples, as he pretends at this time, from ſome accidental converſations of mine thirty years ago, is the ſole inſtance that the Libeller can alledge, with the leaſt ſhadow of truth, of my zeal for Popery; and let him make the moſt of it that malice can make. I am ſure that much more than I ever ſaid to her I have ſaid in converſation, within this laſt twelvemonth, to the moſt zealous of my Proteſtant friends, without offending them or the Proteſtant cauſe, though in vindication of Popery unjuſtly accuſed, or in praiſe of ſome things in the Popiſh, or even Jeſuitical inſtitutions. Truth can never be hurt by truth, nor ſerved by ſlander; but fools will turn inſtruction to folly, and wreſt what they hear to favour the diſpoſitions of their own minds. How have the doctrines about Grace and Election, taught by the beſt divines of our Church, been perverted and abuſed to fanaticiſm and enthuſiaſm by ignorant people!

Before I conclude I beg leave to take notice of two falſhoods fathered upon me by the Libeller, in page 42 of his Libel, where he writes thus: *It can alſo be proved upon our Hiſtorian, that he invented* another

another falſhood, *about the delay of his ſecond volume*; *for he told many gentlemen that he waited till the paper came from* Holland *on which it was to be printed*; *whereas, it is notorious that no ſuch paper ever was ſent for*; *that volume of the Hiſtory of the Popes being printed on* Engliſh *paper bought of Al—n* Janſſen, *as will appear from accounts ſtill in being.*

This the Libeller, perhaps, may have heard at his intelligence office of ſcandal, where he heard that I attended Dr. *Aſpinwall* in his laſt illneſs, and that he died a faithful ſon of the Church of *Rome.* But I never ſaid that I waited for paper from *Holland.* On the contrary, I piqued myſelf upon uſing no other paper but *Engliſh:* and I am very confident that the Libeller can no more name any Gentleman out of *the many whom I told that I waited till the paper came from* Holland, than he can name any one perſon, whom Mrs. *Aſpinwall* told, that *ſhe would not permit a prieſt to adminiſter extreme unction to the doctor, who deſired it,* though *ſhe made no ſecret,* as is poſitively aſſerted by this writer, *of her huſband's dying ſentiments,* and muſt conſequently have ſpoken of them to hundreds. I ſhall add, that it was not the publication of my ſecond but of my third volume that was delayed for want of paper, of *Engliſh paper.* For Alderman *Janſſen,* who from the beginning had ſupplied me with paper, having no more of the ſame ſort with that on which the two firſt volumes and part of the third were printed, I waited a conſiderable time for the ſame paper, being unwilling to leave him. But he let me know at laſt by a letter, which I have ſtill by me, that *the paper-maker had ſent him word that the waters were ſo low that he could not even anſwer for the paper all that ſummer, if there did not come plenty of rain.* Hereupon I went to Mr. *Bloſs,* who engaged to ſupply me with the paper I wanted in a fortnight or three weeks at

30692

moſt, and he was as good as his word. If this diligent enquirer, who I find makes it part of his buſineſs to examine the accounts and the books of thoſe I have dealt with, will apply to Mr. *Bloſs*, it will *appear from accounts ſtill in being* that I bought of him the paper that Alderman *Janſſen* could not ſupply me with, and paid him punctually for it, as I have punctually paid every other perſon with whom I have ever had any dealings.

In the ſame page I am charged with the following *blunder*, *viz.* with *pretending in a certain family that I had never been a prieſt*, and at the ſame time entertaining the company with ſtories which I had heard in confeſſion; and this in the preſence of the lady of the houſe, *who was*, as I could not but know, *very well acquainted with the* Romiſh *religion*. A blunder indeed! But to whom of my acquaintance did I ever make a ſecret of my having been a prieſt? That I was a prieſt all know who know me. The lady therefore muſt either have miſunderſtood me, with reſpect to that point, or I her. For who but an abſolute idiot could pretend to a Roman Catholic, or indeed to any one acquainted in the leaſt with the *Romiſh* religion, that he had heard confeſſions and yet had never been a prieſt! And why ſhould I have concealed from that lady what I concealed from nobody elſe, what all the world knew? I therefore repeat it, ſhe muſt have miſunderſtood me, or I her.

I think I have now anſwered all that can be ſuppoſed to deſerve any anſwer in the Libeller's Pamphlets; and I ought rather to make an apology for having, in the three I have written on this ſubject, taken notice of ſo many impertinent falſhoods than for having overlooked others, if any are overlooked. The taſk of following ſuch an author through all the dirty kennels, into which he has raked for intelligence and for ſcandal, is too

irkſome

irkſome to me; and to carry my reader with me would offend him too much, and take up a great deal too much of his time. But it would be ſtill more inexcuſable in me, if I were to deſire the attention of the Public, at this buſy ſeaſon, to hear me anſwer the Libeller's *ſcurrilous railings*. I cannot bring myſelf to contend with him in ſcolding: much leſs will I abuſe his patrons and friends, whoever they are, as he has done mine. Some perſons may think too well of him and too ill of me, without being either diſhoneſt or fooliſh. I hope that their candour and good underſtanding will, ſooner or later, upon better information and cooler reflection, diſpel any prejudice entertained againſt me; but, if it does not, I am ſure my railing at them in ſo indecent a manner, as the Libeller does at all my friends, would neither do any miſchief to them, nor ſervice to me.

N. B. I am obliged to my unknown friend for his complaint in the *Daily Gazetteer* of *February* 5. againſt the partial omiſſions and groſs miſrepreſentations of my defence in the *Monthly Review*; and he might complain, with as much juſtice and truth, of the authors of the *Critical Review* juſt publiſhed. I therefore beg the Public to be upon their Guard againſt the authors of thoſe monthly Pamphlets, moſt of them being combined with my Enemies againſt me.

F I N I S.

[illegible] to me; and to [illegible] with [illegible] would [illegible] and take up a [illegible] deal [illegible] of his [illegible]. But it would be [illegible] more [illegible] in me, if I were to [illegible] [illegible] Public, at this [illegible], to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] with him in [illegible] [illegible] will I abuse his patrons and friends, whoever [illegible], as he has done mine. [illegible] [illegible] too well of him and [illegible] of me, without [illegible] either dishonest or foolish. I hope that [illegible] and good understanding will, [illegible], upon better information and cooler [illegible], [illegible] any prejudice entertained against me; but, [illegible] does not, I am sure my [illegible] at them in [illegible] a manner, as the [illegible] does at [illegible] friends, would neither do any [illegible] to them, nor service to me.

[illegible] I am obliged to my unknown friend for his complaint [illegible] the *Daily Gazetteer* of *February* 5. [illegible] omissions and gross misrepre[illegible] of my defence in the *Monthly Review*; [illegible] might [illegible], with as much justice and [illegible], of [illegible] of the *Critical Review* just published. I [illegible] beg the Public to be upon their Guard [illegible] authors of those [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] of them being combined with my [illegible].

FINIS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES
THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below

22 1947

orm L-9
0m-1,'41(1122)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
AT
LOS ANGELES
LIBRARY

BX
4705 Bower -
B73D7sa Mr. Bower's
v.2 answer.

DEMCO 284N

University Of California - Los Angeles
L 006 915 993 7

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 001 435 219 9

BX
4705
B73D7sa
v.2